
Hoosier Archives is a periodic listing of the Diplomacy archives of Walter Buchanan, R. R. 3, Lebanon, Indiana 46052, telephone (317) 482-2824; Archives Director, N3FGBDD; a Director of The Diplomacy Association; and a member of the IFWDS. Since the archives is virtually complete in at least xerox form back to 1966, the archives listing will only appear quarterly, the last being in issue #35, or as further substantial additions are acquired. However, additions to the archives are solicited, either through originals, which are preferred, or a loan to permit xeroxing. Also, postage fees will be paid for duplicates so that they can be made available to others. The main purpose of Hoosier Archives is to make available information from the archives, such as Diplomacy articles, game news, etc., as well as to serve as a medium for original articles, which are solicited. This is Albatross Press publication #38.

INTO THE ARCHIVES NO. 6

Original articles are starting to become standard fare in Hoosier Archives. This week we are honored to have the first of a series of articles by Rick Brooks, who is considered by Rod Walker to be one of the best tacticians around. He is one of the most experienced postal players, his first game being in 1965, and he received honorable mention in the last Beyerlein Poll. I might also add that it is a pleasure for me to have a fellow Hoosier in the spotlight!

DIPLOMACY AS I SEE IT

by Rick Brooks

The Mythology of Diplomacy--Part One: Chance

"'Diplomacy' is a game of skill and cunning negotiations. Chance plays no part."--from the "Rules for Diplomacy."

Yes, Virginia, there is chance in Diplomacy--and it didn't sneak in last week either. Even chess has a chance element when you consider the human element. There have been several items on the psychological warfare element of chess, and psychology is still more of an art than a science.

With seven players in a Diplomacy mail game--is there really any other kind?--your fate depends on the personalities of at least two other guys that you may know nothing about. So you write and hope. Player #1 has seen a Diplomacy game where you were too trusting--if you can't trust your own wife...?--and has decided that you are an easy mark. Player #2 gets annoyed when you don't publish your propaganda to agree with his imaginary world. Player #3 has just been doublecrossed by your country in another game and is hung over to boot when your letter enters his life. Player #4 has been doublecrossed by you in an earlier game and writes all five other players, including a Xeroxed copy of your two letters--one promising eternal friendship and the second giving him the horse laugh. Player #5 is being wiped out by you in another game and player #6 is a close buddy of #5. If you can keep your head above water for three years, you are another Clausewitz.

On the other hand, if your neighbors are the trusting sort who fall for your weasel-wording and think their propaganda is worthy of more time than their moves, you can be a duffer at tactics and mop up the board.

To make life more interesting, you can't size up the other players with any degree of success. We all lead a life outside Diplomacy, and local events can affect our game. So the player that you almost lead down the garden path is suddenly too sharp for you. And some players seem to believe in keeping everybody loose by erratic moves every so often--not to mention your dependable partner who gets into a bind in his job and doesn't get his moves in when he was supposed to be supporting your flank.

And there are feuds. I once made a non-aggression pact with a player only to have him move a unit into my territory on the next move. Now I'm a strong believer in trying to expand outward with an unbroken front line. When he came through my line, I hit him with everything I could on the next move. He howled that I'd broken the pact, and besides he had been moving through my territory to attack my ally. So he swore to attack me in all our other games. This ticked me off so that I worked up the best alliance that I could against him in the other games. In one, he was Turkey fighting France and Russia while I was England. When I found out that he had just been mouthing off, he was pretty well done for.

As Clausewitz says, "Once you have taken a decision you should not let any danger or any temptation deflect you from the objective decided upon, but you must remain true to the basic outline of the plan of operations" (my emphasis). So I kept on with the battle plans and he dropped out of our games rather than let me get him.

So make the most out of your moves. Even if the luck of the game goes against you, a defense may stall things until you can negotiate something, or maybe the alliance against you will collapse.

In one game, I played Austria and was allied with Italy and Russia against England and France. England held all of Scandinavia and St. Pete while France blocked the W. Med. They shared Germany. Italy was pretty well stalled in the south, while I was deadlocked with France in southern Germany, and Russia didn't want to risk annoying France by hammering at the joint in Germany. I was getting worried that our three-way alliance might crack open if we stayed deadlocked (foolish of me, as Italy and Russia were strongly committed in their defense) when England got impatient and stabbed France. When France reacted, we surged into Germany and took over the W. Med. When we put the pressure on England all over the front, he was spread too thin.

There are a sizable amount of players who drop out, not necessarily because of a bad set-up. There are several games that have been won by replacements. I was in a game where I was the only player that wasn't replaced. There was another where all players but one had at least one replacement. In 1966B (GRAUSTARK, Boardman GM) there were 14 players, with France and Austria each having 4. I almost got to replace Turkey in either QDC or QFC (DIPLOPHOBIA, Miller GM) when he had a comfortable lead. But after missing one move, he came to his senses and submitted the next. So when you've sized up one player, he may be replaced.

Or you may have an ally who vacillates and changes his moves at the last moment, leaving you with a letter the day after moves are due. Or he can be a non-stop writer with diarrhea of the typewriter and leave you with the impression, just before you have to send in your moves, that the unit he especially mentioned is supposed to split in two and part head north while the rest supports him in place.

And there is The United States Post Office Department--which is now operating under the alias of the Postal Service. The name has been changed...not to protect the innocent, but to confuse them. The Fremont P.O. is lousy. In my first game, GB-1965C (BARAD-DUR, Chalker GM) I missed both Fall 1901 and Fall 1902 moves through their arriving late. I constantly have mail taking several days to get here (answers taking longer, too) and then an occasional letter from the west coast will waltz through in two days just to show me how well they can do if they want to. Airmailing doesn't seem to make much difference. Game GCC (DIPLOPHOBIA), as I write, has just been won by Turkey. England's fall moves that could have resulted in a draw were airmailed from the west coast to the east coast and took 29 days! General order on file and tentative moves fired off as soon as you get the results of the last set are a good idea ...if the GM allows such stuff.

The GM can cause trouble. I got reamed in an early game because the GM didn't clarify his rules. He said that he was playing by Boardman's rules but failed to state how these differed from the usual Games Bureau rules--and he was putting out a GB zine. So with a two on one, I dislodged an enemy unit that ran head on at the dislodging unit. When I tried to follow up with a unit into the space the dislodging unit left open, it was ruled blocked out by the unit dislodged (reverse of Konig's Rule)! I had never given something like that any consideration and still consider it asinine.

I have been in another game for three or four months and have yet to see the GM's house rules despite having asked for them three times. So I don't know about Miller's Rule and Konig's Rule, or if he allows general orders and/or tentative orders--not to mention any other idiosyncrasies that he may have. I may find out the hard way.

Perhaps the worst is a player with a theory. In one game, Austria and Turkey (me) both had an alliance with Russia against the other. Russia moved F Sev to Black Sea in Spring 1901 despite the terms of our alliance. Then he moved into Budapest when Austria uncovered his flank. So we allied against Russia. Then Austria doublecrossed me and helped Russia to get me. His reason? An alliance between Austria and Turkey can't work. I was able to point out one between Austria, Turkey and Italy that had worked. (I remember it for a beautiful convoy from Turkey to Wales.) So now I'm going under. And Austria? He has no units in Budapest or Vienna while Russia has A Rumania, A Sev and F Black Sea. Austria just built F Trieste while Russia built A Warsaw. Russia has been busy and doublecrossed England twice and Germany once.

Maybe Austria has a theory about alliances between Russia and Austria?!

For those of you who know my prejudices, I hasten to add that only Russia is from New York. Austria seems to be just a simple country boy.

And now that The Diplomacy Association has started a consulting service, you might run into a player being counseled by one that dislikes you. I hope that none of the 5 players on my SoB list ever get into a game where I'm counseling someone. The temptation would be awfully strong. A consultant might also completely change a novice's style of play.

And if you read too many articles on how to play Diplomacy--such as this one--you could suffer the fate of the poor centipede who fell in the ditch after trying to figure out which leg came after which.

Yes, Virginia, there is a lot of chance in Diplomacy. How's about letting your sugar daddy play this move for you? It'll shake things up a bit more.

BEYERLEIN PLAYER POLL NO. 2

TOP BOARD	S	N	SECOND BOARD	S	N
1. Erenton ver Ploeg (2)	130	13	8. Gary Jones	59	9
2. Eugene Prosnitz (2)	132	10	9. Doug Beyerlein	58	9
3. John Smythe (3)	121	8	10. Hal Naus	53	6
4. Rod Walker	116	12	11. Larry Peery	50	7
5. John Beshara (2)	109	9	12. George Schelz, Jr. (1)	43	5
6. Derek Nelson	74	6	12. Edi Birsan	43	6
7. Andy Phillips	67	7	14. John McCallum (1)	38	5
			14. Buddy Tretick (1)	38	5

Players with 17 points or more: Ackerman (1), Brooks (1), Eytwerk, Cordes (1), De Witt, Eller, Goldstein, Huddleston, Key, Lakofka, Mehane, R. Miller, Pournelle, Pulsipher, Reinsel, Rosamalia, St. Cyr, Strayer (1), Vagts, & von Metzke.

Note: S means the score or total points tabulated from the ballots, N means the number of ballots listing the player's name on the top board or the second board. Scoring is figured on the following basis: 20 points for 1st place, 17 for 2nd, 15 for 3rd, 13 for 4th, 11 for 5th, 9 for 6th, 8 for 7th, etc.

A total of 17 ballots were cast. Charles Turner's name has been removed from the list of currently-active players and therefore he was not rated on this poll. The number in parentheses are the number of first-place votes cast for those players. A few ballots were returned with only one name listed or all the players tied for first place. This type of returned ballot will not be tabulated in the future.

The ballots for the third poll will go out via Miller in THE FORUM #4. Also, every editor is asked to mention the poll and to ask that their readers send in their ballot for the top 14 players. Send your votes to Doug Beyerlein, 3934 S.W. Southern, Seattle, Washington 98116.

NOTE ON TDA REFERENDUM

Those of you who are cognizant of my involvement in the current TDA controversy probably realize by now that it is my desire to keep Hoosier Archives out of Diplomacy "politics." I do this since Hoosier Archives' sole purpose is to publish the archives listing periodically and to make services from it available to the Diplomacy world in general, such as article reprints, game information, and of course Diplomacy 'zines themselves. However, I feel a peaceful settlement of the current TDA feud is necessary for the well-being of the hobby in general, and this can only be done after the majority of Diplomats make their views known. That is the purpose of the enclosed TDA Referendum in Hoosier Archives. I urge you to fill it out, using the back of the sheet when necessary, and send it to Larry Peery, 816 24th St., San Diego, California 92102. Also, if there are any questions you would like to see included on a final Referendum ballot concerning TDA, feel free to list them.

TDA REFERENDUM INFORMATION SHEET

1. Name _____ 2. Address _____
3. Are you a member of TDA? YES _____ NO _____
4. If NO, would you like to ~~join~~ bring so may be done by enclosing \$1.00 with this sheet when you return it or by sending \$1.00 to Mr. John Beshara, 155 W. 68 St., Apt. 1021, NY, NY 10023.
5. Do you hold any position of authority in TDA? YES _____ NO _____ If so, what? _____
6. Have you read Veritas Vincit? YES _____ NO _____
7. Have you returned the questionnaire provided with it? YES _____ NO _____
8. Are you satisfied with the way TDA is being run by John Beshara and the other members of the Board of Directors? YES _____ NO _____ WHY? _____
9. Do you believe the membership list of TDA members should be published? YES _____ NO _____
10. Do you believe that TDA should have a written constitution? YES _____ NO _____
11. If YES, do you feel the constitution should include: (circle appropriate choices)

A. Authority Structure	D. Provisions for Elections of Officers
B. Statement of Purposes	E. Restrictions on Membership
C. Provisions for Dues, etc.	F. Other (explain)
12. Explain briefly how you think TDA should be organized.
13. Do you think policy-making authority should be vested in: (circle one) A. AN INDIVIDUAL (such as a chairman of the board or other executive authority) B. A COLLEGIATE BODY (such as a board or committee).
14. Do you think executive authority should be vested in: (circle one) A. AN INDIVIDUAL (such as a chairman of the board or other executive authority) B. A COLLEGIATE BODY (such as a board or committee).
15. Do you think the chief executive officer should be subject to control by: (circle one)

A. A Collegiate Body (such as a board of directors)	C. Both of these
B. The membership at large	
16. LIST the purposes, functions, goals you feel TDA should have: _____
17. Which do you think is a reasonable amount for yearly dues?

\$5 _____	\$4 _____	\$3 _____	\$2 _____	\$1 _____
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------
18. Do you think TDA should publish a newsletter: Quarterly _____ Bimonthly _____ Monthly _____
19. Do you think the editor of the newsletter should be: (circle one)

A. A member of the Board of Directors	D. Separate from the executive officer, but responsible to the Board of Directors
B. Also the executive officer	E. Other: (explain)
C. Separate from the executive office, but responsible to him	
20. Do you think officers should be elected: (answer A or B, C or D, E or F)

A. Yearly	C. On a regional basis	E. Secretly
B. Biannually	D. On a national basis	F. By open ballot
21. One suggestion (proposed in Veritas Vincit) suggested the following structure: A 9-man Board of Directors as a policy-making group consisting of: 3 Eastern members, 3 Central members, 3 Western members; Each region to include a secretary and a non-publishing member. The Board would elect its own chairman to serve as its administrative assistant. Do you APPROVE _____ DISAPPROVE _____ of this suggestion?
22. Do you propose an alternative? YES _____ NO _____ If YES, what? _____
23. Should membership in TDA be restricted to: (circle one)

A. Postal Diplomacy players <u>only</u>	C. Any interested persons
B. Face to face Diplomacy and postal Diplomacy players only	
24. Should a yearly budget be adopted by: (circle one)

A. The membership at large	B. The Board of Directors only
----------------------------	--------------------------------
25. If you are nominated for election to a new Board of Directors, would you: (circle one)

A. Accept	B. Not accept	C. Agree to run for election
-----------	---------------	------------------------------
26. Do you wish to nominate any individuals (maximum of three) from your region for membership on the Board? YES _____ NO _____
27. If Yes, please list them: 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
28. Do you wish to nominate any individuals (maximum of three from anywhere for membership on the Board? YES _____ NO _____
29. If Yes, please list them: 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____
30. If an effort to reform TDA fails, would you be willing to: (circle as appropriate)

A. Join another organization (such as IFWDS)	C. Remain a member of TDA under a leadership other than the current one
B. Resign from TDA	